

Volume VII

OCTOBER, 1912

Number 3

# BULLETIN

## THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

MIGRATION AND INTERCHANGE OF  
GRADUATE STUDENTS

STATUS OF WOMEN IN COLLEGE AND  
UNIVERSITY EDUCATION

PUBLISHED BY

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

225 CHARLES STREET, BOSTON

CAMBRIDGE

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

Issued monthly, except June, July, and September

Entered as second-class matter March 8, 1911, at Boston,  
Massachusetts, under Act of April 23, 1910

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,  
Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 25, 1918

# MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF ZOOLOGISTS

E. H. COOPER (Chicago) Columbia University

W. L. COOPER (New York) Cornell University

H. W. COOPER (New York) Institute of Technology

HAROLD COOPER (New York) University of California

COOPER, J. (New York) University of California

COOPER, J. (New York) University of California

COOPER, J. (New York) University of California

COOPER, J. (New York) University of California

COOPER, J. (New York) University of California

COOPER, J. (New York) University of California

COOPER, J. (New York) University of California

COOPER, J. (New York) University of California

COOPER, J. (New York) University of California

COOPER, J. (New York) University of California

COOPER, J. (New York) University of California

COOPER, J. (New York) University of California

COOPER, J. (New York) University of California

COOPER, J. (New York) University of California

COOPER, J. (New York) University of California

COOPER, J. (New York) University of California

COOPER, J. (New York) University of California

COOPER, J. (New York) University of California

COOPER, J. (New York) University of California

COOPER, J. (New York) University of California

VOLUME VII

OCTOBER, 1921

NUMBER 6

**BULLETIN**  
**OF**  
**THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION**  
**OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS**

**MIGRATION AND INTERCHANGE OF  
GRADUATE STUDENTS**

**STATUS OF WOMEN IN COLLEGE AND  
UNIVERSITY FACULTIES**

**PUBLISHED BY**  
**THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS**  
**222 CHARLES RIVER ROAD**  
**CAMBRIDGE**  
**BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

General Announcements	PAGE
Annual Meeting, Constitutional Amendments .....	3
American Council on Education .....	3
American University Union in Europe .....	4
British Universities Congress .....	5
British Association of University Teachers .....	6
Association of German Universities .....	6
The British Library of Information .....	7
Intercollegiate Liberal League .....	8
Council Business .....	9
<b>Announcements from Local Branches</b>	
Officers Elected .....	11
University of Idaho .....	11
University of Chicago: Country-wide Participation in University Appointments .....	11
Preliminary Report of Committee H, on Increased Migra- tion and Interchange of Graduate Students .....	16
Report of Committee W, on Status of Women in College and University Faculties .....	21
<b>Recent Educational Discussion</b>	
Government of Universities; <i>W. A. Merrill</i> .....	33
Extracts from Inaugural Address; <i>L. D. Coffman</i> .....	35
Public Service of the University of Virginia; <i>E. A.</i> <i>Alderman</i> .....	37
Limitation of Numbers in Colleges; <i>J. R. Angell</i> .....	38
History for Everybody; <i>H. G. Wells</i> .....	39
Sanity as Related to Athletics; <i>P. K. Holmes</i> .....	40
The Professor on Behalf of his Profession; <i>J. E.</i> <i>Kirkpatrick</i> .....	41
Workmen's Colleges .....	43
The Antioch Plan .....	45
Distribution of American Colleges .....	47
<b>Membership</b>	
Members Elected .....	52
Nominations for Membership .....	54



## GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

**ANNUAL MEETING.**—The Annual Meeting of the Association will be held as previously announced in connection with the December meetings of the American Economic Association and the American Political Science Association at Pittsburgh, December 29 and 30.

The program will be based particularly on the work of Committee H (Migration and Interchange of Graduate Students) and Committee Z (Economic Condition of the Profession).

Committee A (Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure) and Committee T (Place and Function of Faculties in University Government and Administration) have also been asked to report on specific topics as stated on page 9.

### *Constitutional Amendments*

Constitutional amendments will be presented, the first defining Local Branches and a second authorizing the Council to fill the vacancies in offices arising during the year or through failure of the provisions for nomination and election.

**COMMITTEE A, ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE.**—The following sub-committee has been appointed for investigation of the dismissal of George L. Clark at the University of Missouri: Chairman, Herman G. James (Government), Texas; F. E. Kester (Physics), Kansas; J. P. Lichtenberger (Sociology), Pennsylvania; W. A. Oldfather (Classics), Illinois; H. S. White (Mathematics), Vassar.

**AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION.**—*The Educational Record*, Vol. II, No. 3, July, 1921, contains a report of the Annual Meeting of the Council, devoted mainly to a discussion of the proposed Department of Public Welfare, and to a series of addresses on Standards by G. D. Olds of the National Conference Committee, Clyde Furst of the Carnegie Foundation, K. C. Babcock of the University of Illinois, George F. Zook of the U.S. Bureau of Education, Rt. Rev. Edward A. Pace of the Catholic Educational Association, R. L. Kelly, representing the Church

Boards of Education, H. P. Judson of the University of Chicago, and James H. Kirkland of Vanderbilt University.

A report follows on recommendations concerning the admission of holders of certain degrees and certificates from Latin-American institutions to study at American colleges and universities.

**AMERICAN UNIVERSITY UNION IN EUROPE.**—Professor Paul Van Dyke, Princeton, has been appointed Director of the Continental Division for 1921-22, in succession to Professor E. B. Babcock, New York University, who is returning from Paris in the fall. The trustees of the Union reappointed Dr. H. S. Krans Assistant Director at Paris, and Dr. G. E. MacLean Director of the British Division, which has its headquarters at 50 Russell Square, London. Students who wish to enter British or French universities may write to one of the gentlemen named, or to the secretary of the trustees, Professor J. W. Cunliffe, Columbia University.

" . . . The need for intellectual interchange across the Atlantic has been realized by the Americans most directly concerned, those engaged professionally in higher education, and they have done their utmost by simple and inexpensive organizations to meet the demands of the situation. The American University Union in Europe and the American Council on Education have been organized and sustained by the American universities, at a time when their resources were strained to the utmost for their own needs.

"If the world is ever to get out of the tangle of conflicting interests, prejudices, distrusts, and recriminations which just now afflict us in their most extreme form, it must be by the slow process of mutual understanding and appreciation. National differences of character, of ideals, and of achievement, there must always be, and no one in his senses would strive to do away with them; but when ignorance and prejudice inflame these differences to promote international dislike and distrust, we are living in a dangerous atmosphere which threatens not only every civilized nation, but civilization itself. The war brought the world close enough to the brink of disaster for everybody to realize this. Of the many influences which make for a better state of things, education is the most potent, and no set of people are more influential than those who are to have the training of American

youth. An educated American who has seen with his own eyes what the British and French are like, will be able to dissipate many a mist of misunderstanding in his own community, and thus repay the debt of intellectual stimulus he has incurred by his residence abroad. The inheritors of European civilization on this continent—we owe little to the North American Indians—need to refresh their minds and spirits by visiting the homes of their fathers and coming into contact with recent developments of European science and art, just as the Europeans need to enlarge their vision by acquaintance with the achievements and purposes of the vast new civilization which has grown up on this continent. It is an intellectual interchange by which both sides are the gainers.”—*J. W. Cunliffe*.

**BRITISH UNIVERSITIES CONGRESS.**—The second Congress of the Universities of the British Empire met in Oxford on July 5-8. Thirty-seven overseas universities were represented by ninety-four delegates and twenty-two representatives, of whom the very large majority had gone to England for the express purpose of attending the Congress. For a month the delegates were the guests of the home universities.

The program included the following subjects:

The universities and the balance of studies. (1) The place of the humanities in the education of men of science and men of affairs. (2) The place of the physical and natural sciences in general education. (3) The question of specialism in university curricula.

The universities and the teaching of civics, politics, and social economics.

The universities and secondary education. (1) The frontiers of the secondary school and the university. (2) The influence of university entrance requirements upon the curricula of secondary schools.

The universities and adult education. (1) Lectures for the general public within the walls of the university. (2) Extramural work.

The universities and technological education.

The universities and training for commerce, industry, and administration.

The universities and the training of school-teachers.

University finance.

The universities and research.

Interchange of teachers and students. (1) The institution of a Sabbatical year for professors. (2) Provision of temporary junior posts for graduates of colonial and foreign universities, (3) How to raise funds to make a trust for the promotion of the migration of students. (4) Equivalence of entrance examination. (5) Mutual recognition of study and examination.

BRITISH ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS.—The recent Annual Meeting of the Council of the Association of University Teachers was held at Bedford College, London, and was well attended by delegates from the various university institutions of England and Wales. The president, Professor John Strong of the University of Leeds, in his retiring address indicated the general aims of the Association, the lines on which it has been working, the progress made, and some of the more important problems opening up. The primary aims were the advancement of knowledge and the furtherance of the interests of the universities. . . . Such questions as teachers' salaries and superannuation were, under present conditions, insistent. . . . The relation of the universities to the state and to the local authorities would demand more and more serious consideration. While greater financial support from the government was imperative, the matter of similar and more uniform support from the local education authorities was urgent. Consideration of these points gave rise to the question of the possible infringement of the present autonomy of the universities—a matter of vital importance to the teaching body.—*School and Society*.

ASSOCIATION OF GERMAN UNIVERSITIES.—The subjects discussed at the meeting of the Association at Halle in May were:

(1) The elementary schools; (2) Academic promotions; (3) Limitations to be imposed on the universities in the way of number of students, appropriations and tuitions; (4) The economic situation of the university teacher; (5) What the students are thinking about today; (6) Athletics; (7) Price of books; (8) Part the university is to play in the great Federal Economic Council; (9) Relation of the universities to foreign countries and their students; (10) The use of the German language in corresponding with former enemy countries; (11) Students' aids.—*School and Society*.

**MEMBERS IN CHINA.**—The following extract is from an interesting letter received during the summer from a former member now in China:

"As a former member of the American Association of University Professors and now retained as a member for the period of two years I have had it on my mind to write to you for some time relative to the matter of allowing professors of foreign universities to become members of the Association.

"During the past winter I have become quite well acquainted with the professors of the University of Nanking and they have become interested in the BULLETINS which I have been receiving, for they contain much that is of interest to them here. The problems of teaching and the problems of the institution here are not unlike those of the universities at home. The foreign members of the faculty usually comprise a carefully selected lot of men and they would do honor to any institution. I can see no reason why they should not be members of the Association and enjoy the help that such an Association is able to offer. Is there any reason why being a professor of a foreign university of high standing should not allow one to be a member of an Association that has for its purpose the mutual welfare of all?"

---

Professor Louis Levine of the Association has written recently from Riga, Latvia, asking the approval of the officers for his communication with the University Association of Russia to see in what way we can reestablish relations and perhaps be of assistance to them.

THE BRITISH LIBRARY OF INFORMATION, 44 WHITEHALL STREET, New York, was established in 1920 and aims to act as an extension of the News Department at the Foreign Office for the convenience of American citizens who wish to keep themselves informed of current affairs in Great Britain and various parts of the British Empire. It is in no sense a bureau of propaganda, but rather a repository for accurate information on current affairs, particularly as they affect relations between America and the British Empire. The Director, Mr. Robert Wilberforce, will



be glad to enter into correspondence with professors, particularly of History, Political Science, Political Economy, and English, in connection with their work. Bibliographies on subjects such as India, Imperial Policy, English, Scotch and Irish History, etc., are in preparation.

INTERCOLLEGIATE LIBERAL LEAGUE.—The League was organized at Cambridge in April, 1921. The constitution defines its purpose in Article 2, as follows:

"To bring about a fair and open-minded consideration of social, industrial, political and international questions by groups of college students. The organization will espouse no creed or principle other than that of complete freedom of assembly and discussion in the colleges. Its ultimate aim will be to create among college men and women an intelligent interest in the problems of the day."

The voting membership consists (a) of students in institutions of learning of collegiate grade; (b) of ex-students of institutions of college grade; (c) of teachers and administrative officers in institutions of learning of college grade.



## COUNCIL BUSINESS

A meeting of the Executive Committee with the chairmen of certain special and standing committees was held in New York, May 21 last, for the discussion of a number of important matters of Association policy.

Committee A (Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure) was requested to collect and publish—if possible in tabulated form—information with regard to rules of tenure and the present practice and procedure of dismissals in respect to as many of the larger colleges and universities as can conveniently be covered, with the hope that the results may be circulated to local branches early enough for discussion in advance of the annual meeting and at that time.

On the basis of a proposal by the Treasurer and a recommendation from the Smith College Local Branch (published in the May BULLETIN), the Secretary of the Association was requested to communicate with the Chairman of Committee B (Methods of Appointment and Promotion) as to the practicability of organizing a clearing-house of information in regard to opportunities for academic appointment, with the understanding that the question of the possible assumption of such a function by the American Council on Education will be considered.

Special subjects for discussion at the next Annual Meeting were designated as follows: Committee A (see above), Committee G, Methods of Increasing the Intellectual Interest and Raising the Intellectual Standards of Undergraduates (a change of chairmanship makes it necessary to postpone this until 1922), Committee H, on the Desirability and Practicability of Increased Migration and Interchange of Graduate Students, and Committee Z, on the Economic Condition of the Profession. The Chairman of Committee T, on Place and Function of Faculties, has also been asked to prepare a tabulation of the forms of organization and government in the principal institutions, showing the nature and degree of faculty participation therein.

The question of a subvention for members of the Council attending annual meetings was discussed and it was voted to recommend to the Council that financial aid be appropriated

if in the judgment of the officers such action is necessary in order to insure adequate representation of the Council either at the next Annual Meeting or at such other time as may be preferable.

A suggestion that in addition to meetings of the present type in December a general meeting of members be held quadrennially in the summer, was referred to the next Annual Meeting.

The possible development of a general referendum procedure like that of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce was discussed, without action.

With a view to increasing participation in the active work of the Association, the Secretary undertook to prepare a list of institutions having the requisite number of members but as yet no local branch organization. The list includes: Adelphi, Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Carnegie, Colorado Agricultural, Columbia, Cornell, Georgia, Goucher, Hamline, Harvard, Illinois, Kenyon, Mississippi, Montana, New York University, Oberlin, Ohio Wesleyan, Oregon Agricultural, Rutgers, Saint Olaf, South Dakota, Southern California, Vermont, Wabash, Washington State (College), Wesleyan.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM LOCAL BRANCHES

### OFFICERS ELECTED.—

Colgate University: Chairman, F. C. French.

Purdue University: Chairman, H. C. Pepper; Secretary, Otto Greiner.

Syracuse University: Chairman, W. P. Graham; Secretary, W. G. Bullard.

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO.—At a meeting of the Faculty of the University last April, President Upham announced that thereafter professors and instructors would be on the basis of permanent tenure of office instead of annual appointment, which has been the custom for many years.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.—The local branch sends in the following interesting report of a committee on Country-wide Participation in University Appointments. The report has been referred to Committee B, on Methods of Appointment and Promotion. Comments upon it by local branches or members may be addressed to T. H. Morgan, Columbia University, Chairman of Committee B.

### COUNTRY-WIDE PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY APPOINTMENTS

A report by a committee to the local branch at the University of Chicago:

*Introduction.*—It has been assumed, almost invariably, that democratic control of university appointments implies that the particular local faculty concerned be endowed with the appointing power or, at least, with a power of initiative, which would be practically equivalent to such power. But clearly this would result in one of two situations both thoroughly undesirable. Either the faculty as a whole would follow the recommendations of the individual department concerned, or else each member of the faculty would try to act independently. In the former case

the appointing power would in effect be an individual department, moreover at a moment when its strength and judgment is below normal, since the vacancy to be filled may be that caused by the death or departure of its strongest member. And, even at *normal* strength the average department of an average institution may not possess the very best of judgment, nor be inclined to act with the purest of intentions. The other alternative, however, is still worse. Without the guidance of expert opinion of some kind, the vast majority of the votes would be cast ignorantly and at random or, worse yet, degenerate into expressions of personal and impure motives.

It seems to us, therefore, that the local faculty concerned is not the body best fitted for the initiative in making appointments. A method should rather be devised for enabling our institutions to profit by advice the wisdom of whose source is above doubt. This can be accomplished by appealing to the best professional opinion available *throughout the country* rather than only that available at a given place, thus securing democratic control and efficiency at the same time.

The following plan is intended to accomplish these purposes by making use of certain strong organizations already well established; our National Societies for the several branches of learning.\* It is not proposed to take away from the administrative officers any of the power which is rightfully theirs. It merely provides for those among them who are honest and intelligent a really reliable source of information. It provides for an open, public, and efficient method of accomplishing a purpose which honest administrators, at present, usually attempt to accomplish by secret, confidential, and haphazard communications which fail to obtain the best results precisely on account of their lack of system and publicity. The plan is also intended to help those institutions whose administrative heads are not imbued with pure intentions or who lack the necessary information for wise action, by making it increasingly difficult to hide impure motives,

\*While these societies seem to us the best agencies for this, the American Council on Education, the American Association of University Professors, the Association of American Universities, the National Research Council, the National Academy of Science, might function instead. In what follows, the term "learned societies" may be taken to cover all of these. Perhaps several of these organizations might cooperate in such matters.

and by taking away any reasonable excuse for lack of information.

### *The Plan*

*First. Publication of vacancies.*—Every learned society should establish in its official journal a special department devoted to the announcement of vacancies. The administrative heads of all colleges and universities should be informed of the existence of this department and should be requested to avail themselves of it. The announcements should be as explicit as possible on the items of title, salary, grade and amount of work, probable date of appointment, address to which applications should be sent, date after which no applications will be considered, whether a specialist is desired or preferred, and if so in what special subject. If any of these items are subject to any uncertainty—if, for instance, as is often the case, an institution is not willing to announce a definite sum as salary because it would be willing to pay widely different salaries according to the exigencies of the case—the vacancy and its general character should nevertheless be announced.

*Second. The filling of major positions.*—It seems to us\* that the following plan might serve as a basis for discussion: If an institution desires the services of the society in making an appointment, it should send a request to the secretary describing as closely as possible the nature of the position to be filled and the kind of person desired. The secretary should acknowledge the request and receive assurance from the institution that it is willing to bear the expenses of the nominating committee, which expenses would in most cases be very small. Having received this assurance, the secretary should inform every member of the governing board† of the society, requesting him to make out and send to the secretary before a specified date a list of six names (members or non-members of the society) in order of preference, these to stand as his nominations for the nominating committee. Upon the specified day the secretary should tabu-

\*All of the details are mere suggestions, capable of much variation.

†The ex-presidents of the society might replace the governing board for this purpose, or else a committee of the society especially elected or appointed.



late the votes. The person receiving the highest number of votes should be appointed as chairman, and the two or more following him in the number of votes should be named as members of the nominating committee. It might be provided, if that were thought advisable, that no two men employed in the same institution should be members of the committee. All ties, whether for chairmanship or membership, should be decided by the secretary.\*

If any person so elected to membership in a nominating committee is unable or unwilling to serve, the committee should be completed by election of the person next below him in the total number of votes. Acceptance of membership on the committee should imply renunciation on the part of the person accepting of any intention on his part of being himself a candidate for the position under consideration. (If thought desirable, a rule could be made to insure representation on the committee of the institution especially concerned in the filling of the vacancy.)

As soon as the committee has been finally constituted, the fact should be announced and the names of the members published. This should be coupled with a request to all applicants to forward their applications, a list of their publications and other documents to the chairman, and as far as possible also to the other members of the committee.

It should be the duty of the committee of three elected in this way to consider and weigh carefully the claims of all applicants. But beyond this, it should in all cases survey the entire field and select three or more men who, according to its opinion, would be the best available persons for filling the position under consideration. It should arrange these men in order of preference, giving a brief discussion of the reasons for its decision. The possibility of bracketing two or three men of apparently equal merit should not be excluded, however. The report of the committee should then be forwarded to the institution concerned, for any action which it may choose to take. The list of names recommended by the committee should also be published, preferably, perhaps, in alphabetic order.

\*Instead of selecting a new committee for each case, in the way indicated, a committee might be elected for a stated term to consider all cases which would arise during its term of office.



Most of the work of the committee should be done by correspondence. In many cases, however, it would be necessary, and it would always be desirable, for the committee to have an opportunity for oral discussion. It is not likely that an institution willing to take advantage of this plan would object to the expenses arising from this.

*Third. The filling of minor positions.*—We can see little prospect of success in any attempt on the part of the learned societies to assist in making such appointments, on account of the large number of such positions, and the great amount of work and expense that would be involved. We suggest, however, a standing committee of the governing board appointed for a year, to meet upon the days assigned to meetings of the society, whose duty it would be to make recommendations of this character, the material in each case being properly collected and sifted beforehand by an intelligent clerical assistant. It seems quite likely, however, that the careful filling of major positions would do away with any great necessity of reform in the methods of filling minor positions.

Respectfully submitted,

W. D. HARKINS.

W. A. NITZE.

E. J. WILCZYNSKI.

## PRELIMINARY REPORT OF COMMITTEE H, ON INCREASED MIGRATION AND IN- TERCHANGE OF GRADUATE STUDENTS

A study of the practicability of increased migration and interchange of graduate students must necessarily take into account previous investigations of a similar kind. Such investigations have been conducted by the Association of American Universities and are reported in its Proceedings as follows:

*The Migration of Graduate Students, President Ira Remsen of Johns Hopkins University, Proceedings, Association of American Universities, Second Annual Meeting, 1901, Chicago.*

*Report on Statistics Concerning the Migration of Graduate Students, Dean E. A. Birge, University of Wisconsin, Proceedings Association of American Universities, Third Annual Conference, 1902, Chicago.*

As a basis for further discussion of the subject, it seems advisable to present a summary of these reports.

President Remsen emphasized the broadening effect of migration by bringing the graduate students in contact with more than one leader in the principal subject followed, and concluded that if it is customary to advise our best students to go elsewhere, then migration is in a healthy state and requires no further discussion. He expressed the opinion that the advantages of migration have not come to be clearly recognized for the following reasons:

The traditions of our colleges are against it and counteract migration in university life.

Loyalty of college students to their institution has also affected our university students.

More serious than either of the above is the difficulty of adjusting the work done in one university with that to be done in another, which causes loss of time to those wishing to study for a Ph.D. in more than one institution.

Advertising, free tuition, scholarships, fellowships to increase the number of graduate students in attendance are not in the interest of healthy migration.

The discussion of Mr. Remsen's paper developed a consensus of opinion that migration was in effect to a considerable extent and was being encouraged in many leading institutions. The advantages as well as the disadvantages of fellowships were fully brought out.

Dean Birge was requested by the Executive Committee to prepare a report on statistics concerning migration. A very exhaustive report was presented by Dean Birge at the third Annual Meeting in 1902, on the migration of those graduate students who received their Ph.D. during the years 1896-1901 inclusive and of students in their last year of study for the Ph.D. in 1901.

The investigation was based on reports from the institutions in the Association, then 14, for each individual concerning (1) the institution conferring the Bachelor degree, (2) the place of study during each graduate year, (3) the department of the major subject, (4) fellowships or similar positions held. Eleven institutions rendered 1,437 reports on 1,168 persons who had received the Ph.D. degree and 269 reports on students in their last year. The total number of migrants of both classes was 446. The average per cent. of migrants of the first class was 30, of the latter 38, which shows a tendency of increasing migration, which on the whole is borne out by a classification by years. Arranged by subjects, English, Chemistry, and Mathematics had the smallest, while Economics and Modern Languages had the largest per cent. The high per cent. for Modern Languages was due to study in Europe. The per cent. varied in the different institutions from 6 at Yale to 52 and 58 at Chicago and Wisconsin. Change of institution immediately after receiving the Bachelor degree or attendance only at summer schools was not considered.

If migration in graduate standing from a small institution not in the Association, where the work is chiefly undergraduate, to a reporting institution is excluded, the per cent. of migration is reduced to 18.

It is interesting to note that of the 446 graduate migrants of both classes, 181 migrated from a non-Association to an Association institution, 156 among Association institutions, and 109 included European institutions.

A study of the migrants among six reporting Atlantic seaboard institutions reveals some interesting figures concerning the proportion of migrants of a given institution taking their degree from that institution. Thus of 34 and 25 migrants of Harvard and Johns Hopkins respectively only six each took their degree at these institutions. The remainder migrated for the degree to some other institution. Yale breaks even with 5 to 5, Columbia and Cornell conferred the Ph.D. on two-thirds of their migrants, the former on 18 out of 29, the latter on 13 out of 20, while Pennsylvania conferred the Ph.D. on all but 3 of its reported 28 migrants.

About 75 per cent. have received their Ph.D. from the institutions granting the Bachelor degree, and of these only 16 per cent. also studied elsewhere, namely, 5 per cent. only in the United States and 11 per cent. in Europe.

Including those changing immediately after receiving the Bachelor degree, the migration among Association universities is 53 per cent. of the total. Bachelors and migrants from other colleges are 37 per cent. Of twenty Bachelors of Leland Stanford University, 12 took their Ph.D. elsewhere. Pennsylvania conferred the Ph.D. on 44 of its own 45 Bachelors.

#### Conclusions:

- (1) Migration in U.S. amounts to about one-third as compared to two-thirds in Germany of all receiving the Ph.D.
- (2) There are great differences in different institutions. In each university a fairly constant, slight tendency to increase in later years is noticeable.
- (3) Variations exist in different subjects.
- (4) Causes:
  - (a) Superior facilities (from smaller to larger) explains one-third.
  - (b) Fellowships, etc., favor and hinder migration to a large but indeterminable extent.
  - (c) Sentiment toward institutions granting Bachelor degrees tends strongly to prevent migration.

Nearly twenty years have elapsed since the conclusions were drawn. It might prove interesting to bring these statistics up

to date. We should probably find that migration has greatly increased and that the question of its desirability and practicability has answered itself in the affirmative in the years which have elapsed. The collection of statistics through questionnaire imposes burdens out of all proportion to the value of the object sought on the seeker of the information as well as on those who are to furnish it. If possible, our committee should abstain from engaging in the questionnaire nuisance, which often results in information from different sources which is not comparable. Migration statistics from 1915 to 1919 or even to 1920 would be of little value on account of the war and the period from 1902-15 lies too far in the past to assist in shaping our future course. It would seem more advantageous to attempt a regular reporting system on the part of graduate schools, commencing with the present academic year and to continue the same for five or six years, to obtain data for comparison with Dean Birge's report. The intervening statistics could probably be undertaken at our suggestion by some student in Education.

The conditions are at present without doubt far more favorable to migration than they were twenty years ago. This appears to be due primarily to a more liberal attitude of graduate schools in recognizing Bachelor degrees from other institutions as equivalent to their own without rating differences in undergraduate curricula as deficiencies to the extent formerly practiced. As a matter of fact in some institutions the pendulum seems to have swung a little too far in the other direction to the disadvantage of a proper standard for higher degrees.

Migration is fortunately becoming an important factor in the undergraduate course due to the rapid expansion of the junior college movement. If we designate freshmen and sophomores as lower-division and juniors and seniors as upper-division students, the future alignment of upper-division students may be with the graduate students rather than with lower-division students as at present, a development which should be welcomed because it would produce a broader outlook and a more serious and scholarly attitude among juniors and seniors, who have together too long been afflicted with college provincialism. The graduate school can do much to aid this development by establishing contact with the seniors in the same institution.



Much may be gained in promoting the aims which migration is supposed to accomplish by a better realization of the universities, particularly the state universities, that there is a limit to the activities that can be done with distinction. It is sounder for a graduate school to attract students in a few fields in which it may excel than to attempt to cover every field of learning superficially. Institutions offering the best opportunities for graduate study and research in certain definite fields are even now well known. Greater recognition of their superiority by sister institutions will enable every graduate school to conserve its resources for concentration on its most distinguished departments and will result in exchange of students and better opportunities for them.

The majority of existing fellowships serve the purpose of recruiting the learned professions by attracting students to the institutions which offer them. In some cases no doubt the student makes his choice on the basis of the magnitude of the award rather than on the basis of the superior opportunities for graduate study and research. It may be well worth while to emphasize the value of traveling fellowships to be awarded to promising students for study at real centers of learning in their chosen fields. It would seem to be as great a distinction for an institution to have its distinguished students in sister institutions offering better opportunities in special fields as to attract promising students from other institutions.

Our immediate purpose should be (1) to stimulate and facilitate migration not for its own sake but for the sake of the advantages to be derived by the graduate student by changing to institutions where the greatest masters and facilities in his subject are available; (2) to counteract any tendency that may develop among graduate students to seek the line of least resistance in securing the Ph.D. degree.

A. O. LEUSCHNER, *Chairman.*

The Committee:

F. W. Blackmar, Kansas; A. T. Clay, Yale; J. H. Gray, Carleton; E. R. Hedrick, Missouri; F. W. Kelsey, Michigan; A. W. Meyer, Stanford; A. W. Small, Chicago; F. W. Taussig, Harvard; J. W. Young, Dartmouth; A. O. Leuschner, California, Chairman.



## PRELIMINARY REPORT OF COMMITTEE W, ON STATUS OF WOMEN IN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACULTIES

As a preliminary study of the present status of women in our college and university faculties, your committee has sent out a questionnaire to all of the 176 institutions that are represented in the membership of the American Association of University Professors and has carefully studied the printed catalogs of 155 of these. Ten of the catalogs did not give the data needed, so that this report is based upon the returns from the questionnaire and the study of the catalogs of 145 of these institutions.

### *Colleges for Men Only*

A study of 29 catalogs and 27 questionnaire returns from 29 colleges and universities for men only, including nearly all of the more noted Eastern universities, shows that until quite recently no woman held any grade of professorship in these institutions. At present only two women are found among the nearly two thousand professors in these colleges and universities. One woman was given a professorship of the third rank in the Harvard Medical School about two years ago and another a professorship of the second rank in the Yale School of Education this fall.

### *Colleges for Women Only*

From the examination of the catalogs of 14 colleges for women only and of 13 questionnaire returns from these, it appears that in these colleges the faculties are divided as follows:

	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>
Professors of first rank.....	131.....	163
Professors of second rank.....	34.....	133
Professors of third rank.....	33.....	119
Instructors.....	53.....	323

These 14 colleges include nearly all of the leading separate women's colleges of the country, representing a student body of about ten thousand students.

From the above it appears that, while no professorship of the first class in a college for men only has been filled by a woman, 131 such professorships, or 45 per cent. of the total, in colleges for women only, have been filled by men. Of the 613 professorships of all ranks in these women's colleges, men hold 198, or 32 per cent., while in colleges for men only, women hold only two professorships of any rank out of nearly two thousand, or about one-tenth of 1 per cent. No woman was found holding a professorship of any rank in the College of Arts of any institution for men only.

With apparently only two exceptions, both of very recent date, it has never occurred to the authorities of the colleges for men, in which there are more than thirty thousand men taught, that women could teach successfully in a college for men, or the idea of introducing women into the faculty has been considered unwise on some ground. Apparently it has been rarely even considered. One dean replied that the committee's questionnaire "does not apply to this institution, which is not coeducational." One professor of English wrote, "As — College is not coeducational I make no report." Another dean wrote, "We have never had any at — University, as we are not coeducational." These are typical of a larger number.

If it has proved true, as seems to be universally admitted, that a certain number of men in the faculty of a college for women gives a better-balanced and more stimulating leadership to the students, it may well be asked seriously whether our colleges for men are not blindly following a medieval tradition to the detriment of the students in excluding women entirely from their faculties. This idea seems to be gaining some ground. A very able new dean in one of our most justly noted Eastern universities writes: "When we discover a woman who can handle some subject in our course of study better than a man could handle it, we shall not hesitate to urge the appointment of the woman and we shall, in all probability, be successful in getting it confirmed. . . . President — has admitted that we must in time have women on our faculty. There is, of course, a general prejudice at — against the appointment of women, but it is a prejudice that arises out of the traditional masculinity of the institution. It is neither a violent antagonism nor a judgment

based on study and experience." We do not know whether the language used in speaking of the President's attitude was intended to indicate a recent change of view on his part.

This apparently recent increased appreciation of the possibilities of women in college faculties, which shows slightly here in the men's colleges, is much more apparent in the reports from the coeducational colleges which will be discussed next.

### *Coeducational Colleges and Universities*

The study of the catalogs of 104 and the questionnaire returns from 100 coeducational institutions shows the following distribution of faculty members:

	<i>Full Professors</i>		<i>Associate Professors</i>		<i>Assistant Professors</i>		<i>Instructors</i>	
	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>
Academic	2,147	95	623	71	903	106	1,319	544
Education	190	9	42	17	49	15	38	43
Engineering	431	0	162	3	275	4	478	14
Medicine	826	4	267	3	352	14	876	17
Law	224	0	13	0	16	0	22	1
Commerce	54	1	17	0	43	3	109	26
Agriculture	348	0	139	0	267	2	218	12
Journalism	18	0	4	0	11	3	10	4
Music	130	19	14	5	18	13	120	14
Bible or Theology	81	0	4	2	5	3	13	1
Home Economics	1	53	1	34	0	95	0	243
Physical Education	46	9	15	10	27	34	77	100
Military Science	64	0	6	0	56	0	34	0
Total	4,560	190	1,307	145	2,022	292	3,314	1,019

From the above table it appears that women hold 190 out of a total of 4,760, or exactly 4 per cent. of the full professorships in the coeducational institutions studied, which include practically all of the leading coeducational colleges and universities in the United States. If Home Economics and Physical Education be omitted from consideration, the women hold less than 3 per cent. of the professorships. While more than 31 per cent. of the students in these institutions are women, the women hold only 4 per cent. of the full professorships, and 7.9 per cent. of all professorships, and 23.5 per cent. of the instructorships. Twenty-seven, or 26 per cent., of these institutions have no woman of any grade of professorial rank in the College of Arts and twelve others have only one each. Forty-nine, or 47 per

cent., have no woman holding a professorship of the first rank in the Academic faculty, and 25 have not even a Dean of Women.

One noted Middle-Western coeducational state university with more than 2,500 women students has no woman full professor, and only three of second rank. Seven per cent. of the faculty are women, while women students are 34 per cent. of the student body. Another one of the same kind having a similarly large number of women students reports no woman on the faculty, except in public-health nursing. One Eastern university with more than six hundred on its teaching staff reports only one woman.

#### *Recent Increased Appreciation of Women*

The reports received indicate that there has been quite an awakening to the possibilities of women in university faculties during the last year or two. Twelve universities and colleges, among them four of the largest in the country, report having appointed their first women faculty members during this period. Others indicate that they plan doing so soon.

The following quotations are significant and typical:

"Your questionnaire is for those institutions which have faced problems as between men and women. We are coming to them."

"The attitude of our faculty and regents is rapidly changing."

"There has been a decided tendency in the last five years to more and more recognition of women in high places of responsibility."

"In the last few years the number of women has increased very materially, and our past is no indication of what our future practice will be."

"Until recently we have been unable to secure women with the Ph.D. degree."

"Our women teachers have, up until this year, been emergency teachers."

"I would at the moment give preference to the women out of deference to the tendency of the times, the attitude of the new voters in the State and the fact that men now predominate."

This new attitude appears to have been brought about by five causes:

*First.* The war emergency introduced women to college faculties, in which their work was found to be good and their presence not to bring the evils that had been feared.

*Second.* The present scarcity of good men and the impossibility of securing enough of them in competition with more remunerative work offered outside.

*Third.* The rapid development of departments of education, music, home economics, and public health, added to the influence of summer schools.

*Fourth.* A general awakening of men to the possibilities and rights of women during the war.

*Fifth.* The success of the woman suffrage movement, which seems to have put the "fear of God" into the hearts of not a few ever-watchful university executives.

This new attitude toward women is, however, far from universal. Many still would intone a loud amen to the following resolution passed several years ago by the faculty of one of our most noted Eastern coeducational universities:

*"Resolved* that if it is contemplated by the Board of Trustees to appoint women to seats in the special faculties, with titles, involving under the present statute, membership in the University Faculty, the University Faculty would welcome an opportunity to express its opinion on such action."

The women were appointed, and this faculty expressed its opinion as follows:

*"The University Faculty, while not favoring in general the appointment of women to professorships, interposes no objection to their appointment in the department of Home Economics."*

#### *The Committee's Conclusion*

Neither this committee nor any one else is prepared to state what proportion of the teaching in our colleges and universities should be done by women. It may be, or it may not be, that the experience of the next century will demonstrate the wisdom of allowing women to take over a larger part of the work of higher education, as the experience of the past century has shown the wisdom of their assuming the major part of the burden of pre-



paratory teaching. If we assume that women in men's colleges should have some share in the teaching and in the development of university life, and that in coeducational colleges they should have a share of the faculty labors and honors somewhat in proportion to the numbers of women students present, then the facts brought out above compel one of two conclusions: either women are not yet prepared to accept their share of university teaching, or they are deprived by traditional prejudice of a large part of their just dues.

### *Salaries and Promotion*

The answers to that part of the committee's questionnaire dealing with salaries indicate that women receive equal pay for equal work in 73 per cent. of the eleven women's colleges and 53 per cent. of the fifty-five coeducational colleges reporting on this point. In the 47 per cent. of the coeducational institutions and 27 per cent. of women's colleges in which it is frankly admitted that women are given less salary and lower rank than men for the same work, the difference stated ranges from 10 per cent. to 50 per cent., averaging 18 per cent. In ten cases conflicting statements came from the same institution and hence were discarded.

Evidently, some of the statements tabulated need to be taken with some grains of salt. For example, one well-known president of a large Western state university writes: "The administration has no different policy for men and women. It is conscious of no difference of treatment on sex grounds." But his Dean of Women writes, "There are no women of any rank whatever on the faculty except the Director of Physical Training and myself." Another executive writes, "I have tried to make no distinction but have not escaped the law of supply and demand." This is one of the institutions at which the women have "raised a row" lately, as one male professor puts it, with the result that this executive seems to have since found strength to mitigate considerably the operation of the law of supply and demand—or to appreciably increase the "demand." A professor in the university wrote, "There is a difference still, but not so great as before."



It is very generally reported as true that, in those institutions in which equal pay for equal rank is given women, the promotion of women is much slower even when they do equally as good work as the men. To what extent this is true your committee is unable to state. Such evidence as we have seems to indicate a considerable degree of discrimination in many, even, of the institutions that report equal pay for equal work.

### *Women Securing Equality by Demanding It*

There is evidence of a tendency to increase women's salaries in the institutions in which the women of the faculty or of the State demand it. One case has already been mentioned. From another state university a male professor writes: "Standard full professor's salary is \$4,000. Probably \$3,000 is about the limit for women at present. One woman professor was kept much below that until another one, who was highly valued, started a row over what she regarded as a general policy of discrimination against women. It ended in a scale suggested by the faculty which (wrongly, I think) took no account of sex." At a privately endowed college the trustees not long ago voted a maximum salary of \$1,800 for women and \$3,000 for men of the same rank. On learning that the women of the faculty were about to file a protest, a new schedule was voted and published making no distinction on account of sex.

These instances seem to show that there is considerable truth in the statement sent in by a male professor that women are imposed upon, "because women as a class will not fight back quite as much as men."

### *Reasons Offered for Paying Women Less than Men for the Same Work*

Three reasons are offered for giving women lower rank and smaller salaries than men for equal work: First, the operation of the law of supply and demand; second, the necessity for the support of a family on part of the man; third, the social need of holding men in college teaching. One president of a well-known Western college justifies maximum salaries in his institution of \$2,500 for women and \$4,000 for men on the ground

that men have families to support. No evidence was offered that he practiced the same discrimination against unmarried men. Two other colleges, however, reported consistent action in this matter, one adding 30 per cent. and the other \$1,000 to a man's salary when he married.

The effect of such discrimination against women can be seen in the following quotation from a scholarly woman head of a department in one of the above colleges: "It has seemed bitter to me to have a young man without a higher degree, without special talent, and not a successful teacher, given a larger salary than mine simply because he married. I was a successful teacher of more than twenty years' experience, was professor in charge of a department at — before coming here, and hold the doctor's degree." (The wording of the above was slightly changed in order not to disclose the identity of the party reporting. The meaning and spirit are exactly as sent in.)

Your committee has considered the three reasons usually assigned in justification of giving women less salary and lower rank than men for doing the same work; namely, (1) that there is a social necessity for keeping men in college teaching, (2) that most faculty men must support families, and (3) the operation of law of supply and demand. With regard to the first, your committee cannot admit the justice of requiring women who teach in college faculties to pay out of their salaries, in effect, so disproportionate a part of the cost of supplying the admitted social need of retaining men in college teaching. If it be a *social* need that men should teach in college faculties, then it would seem that *society* should foot the bill and distribute the burden evenly instead of, in effect, taking it out of the budget of the college faculty women. Likewise, with regard to the second reason assigned, it seems unjust to ask these faculty women, in effect, to support so largely out of their justly earned salaries the wives and children of their male colleagues. Without denying the justice of additional remuneration to those who bear and rear children for society, we would suggest that such social service should be paid for by society, requiring college faculty women to pay only their proportionate part as citizens. It should, furthermore, be recognized that many of these unmarried faculty women support dependent relatives.

With regard to the operation of the law of supply and demand, your committee would call attention to the fact that the moral sense of the nation and of nearly all states refuses to allow the labor of even illiterate craftsmen and ditch-diggers to be regarded as a commodity, to be buffeted hither and yon by the unhampered operation of the so-called law of supply and demand. This being true, we believe that it is both desirable and possible to protect from any injurious effects of the operation of this law the ablest and best educated body of women in our nation, who dedicate their lives to the highest service that can be rendered to society. On this point, we would also call attention to the fact that the demand in this case comes, or fails to come, mainly from the very ones who cite the lack of it as their reason for not giving faculty women even-handed justice in matter of rank and salary.

*Are Women Capable of Professional Work of the Highest Order?*

Are women capable of performing the services of university professors of the highest order? If they have failed and will fail here, then they have no right to expect and should not receive honors or salaries equal to those of men.

With the purpose of securing as good evidence as was possible to obtain with regard to the success or failure that has attended the work of the women in our institutions of higher learning, what weaknesses they have shown, and what reasonable judgments and what prejudices lie back of the present condition of women in college faculties, the following questionnaire and letter\* were sent to the dean and to one male and one female professor, whenever there was a woman in the faculty, in each of the institutions represented in the American Association of University Professors.

November 13, 1920.—The American Association of University Professors has appointed a committee of its members to investigate "The Status of Women in College and University Faculties."

This Committee has decided that the best beginning of its work could be made by securing answers to the questions on the inclosed questionnaire from those in the best positions to possess the information desired.

Recognizing the numerous other calls upon the time of those to whom this questionnaire is sent, the questions have been so chosen that they can be

\*Present version somewhat condensed.

answered directly upon the paper as read, without tedious investigation of records, thus taking only a few minutes of time. The questions of fact involving investigation will be studied in another manner. You will note that it is mainly opinion that is sought in this questionnaire. This is one matter in which opinion is of great importance and must be reckoned with.

### QUESTIONNAIRE NO. 1

This report will be regarded as absolutely confidential. No name will be used in connection with reports made and no material used in such manner as to disclose the identity of the party supplying the information. If you are unwilling to answer all the questions, please answer such as you do not object to answering.

Return this to Dr. A. Caswell Ellis, Chairman Committee W, The University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

Name of institution.....Name of person reporting.....

Official position of person reporting.....

1. Are women in your faculty receiving the same salaries as men of the same rank and with equal years of service? If not, about what per cent of difference is there?

2. Have you a definite system of faculty promotions which applies to men and women alike?

3. Of two candidates, one a man and one a woman, of equal training, mental ability and capacity for work, so far as can be determined, would you give preference to the man or the woman? Why?

4. If of the two candidates the woman is superior in equipment and personality, would you hesitate to give her preference? If so, why?

5. In your opinion, how does the teaching of the women in your faculty compare with that of the men? If there is any difference, state in what respect the teaching of the women is usually strong and in what weak as compared with the teaching of men.

6. In your institution, what preference, if any, do the men students show as between men and women as teachers? What preference, if any, do women students show?

7. In your opinion, do the women of your faculty teach advanced classes and inspire students to go on to higher work as well as, or better than, the men?

8. Are women in your faculty given as large an opportunity to teach advanced classes as are men of equal rank? If not, why not?



9. On the average, do the men or the women of your faculty carry the greater number of hours of class and laboratory teaching per week?

10. In your opinion, are the women or the men of your faculty more conscientious in the discharge of their responsibilities to students both in and out of the class room?

11. (a) In your opinion, do the women of your faculty serve as satisfactorily as the men on various committees, or more so?

(b) Are the women of your faculty appointed on the committees that are considered most important to the same extent in proportion to their numbers as are the men?

12. Have the women of your faculty shown themselves physically able to handle as much work as, or more than, men in similar positions?

13. In your opinion, do the women of your faculty, while teaching, continue to advance and improve their scholarship as much as, or more than, the men of similar age or rank?

14. In your opinion, how do the women in your faculty compare with the men in point of productive scholarship?

15. Are the women in your faculty given the same opportunity and encouragement to productive scholarship as are given men of equal rank?

16. In your opinion, do the women of your faculty by their dress, personal appearance and general attitude toward life foster respect for higher education of women in the same, or to a greater, degree than the men thus foster respect for higher education of men?

17. In your opinion, do the women of your faculty take as active an interest as, or more active interest than, the men in the larger issues concerning the life and development of the institution?

18. In your opinion, are the women of your faculty interested in and conversant with the social, civic, and economic problems of the day to the same or greater extent than the men?

19. In your opinion, are the women of your faculty as efficient as, or more efficient than, the men in developing a social consciousness and a social conscience in the students?

20. What per cent of your women teachers have living husbands?

21. Is it against the rules of your institution to employ married women?

22. Is the employment of married women contrary to your custom?



23. Is it against the rule of your institution to employ as instructors at the same time a man and his wife?

24. Please make any suggestions that may seem to you wise for furthering the work of this Committee in investigating the status of women in the college and university faculties.

---

Two hundred and thirty-seven replies to this questionnaire from 140 institutions were received, thus giving exceptionally complete returns. Enough answers were received to give the tabulations a high degree of accuracy—all the accuracy and representative character that can be expected from this type of study. It is true that what is secured is mainly mere opinion, but it is opinion that is of so much moment in determining the status of women in college faculties. It was necessary first to find what opinions were held by those whose opinions determine the status of women.

The returns have been tabulated and leave little doubt as to what is the opinion of the faculty world on most of the important points touched on in the questionnaire. It is possible to determine to what extent some of the opinions widely held are based on fact and to what extent upon ignorance and prejudice. The necessary facts are now being collected by your committee, and therefore the presentation and discussion of the questionnaire returns will be delayed until these facts can be presented along with the opinions collected.

Respectfully submitted for the Committee,

A. CASWELL ELLIS, *Chairman.*

*The Committee:*

Florence Bascom, Bryn Mawr; Cora J. Beckwith, Vassar; Harriet W. Bigelow, Smith; Isabelle Bronk, Swarthmore; Carleton Brown, Minnesota; Caroline Colvin, Maine; John Dewey, Columbia; Anna J. McKeag, Wellesley; D. C. Munro, Princeton; Helen M. Searles, Mt. Holyoke; W. F. Willcox, Cornell; A. C. Ellis, Texas, Chairman.

## RECENT EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

CORRECTION.—A quotation in the May BULLETIN, page 47, was erroneously attributed to the *Review* instead of the *New Republic*.

THE GOVERNMENT OF UNIVERSITIES.—“Many interesting experiments are being made. A very few of the large universities are endeavoring to continue the old democratic régime; all the instructors and administrators are combined into a Senate or General Faculty which jealously retains its power of overruling everybody except the Regents. This method, of course, breaks down whenever the General Faculty grows to any considerable size, for the same reasons that the New England town meeting has broken down. There is too much business to be transacted, members stay away from the meetings, those present cannot know the details of business which they are asked to approve, the work falls into the hands of a few, the actual attendance at the meeting varies constantly, thus causing violent inconsistencies of action, and the only people who have any adequate knowledge of what is going on are the members of the committees who bring in proposals. The meetings are so brief and infrequent that, necessarily, when time is taken for thorough discussion of one subject, many others are considered hastily and some measures passed with no discussion at all. The final result is that a well-disciplined minority comes into control and democracy exists only in name.

“Granted that some superior body is necessary to secure the interests of the whole institution, as in the case, for example, at Chicago, Illinois, Nebraska, and Stanford, the question as to the size of this body is next to be considered. The prevailing tendency is toward a limitation in numbers. The name most commonly chosen is ‘Senate,’ in which the president is always the presiding officer. At Chicago the Senate consists of all professors of full rank; at Illinois, of all full professors and all persons who are in charge of departments; at New York University, of the deans, one professor from each faculty, and certain advisory members from affiliated institutions; at Northwestern, of the deans, directors, and certain elected members from the faculties; at Columbia, of

deans, directors, and representatives from the faculties; at Kansas, of the deans, directors, and professors and associate professors; at Stanford, of professors, associate professors, assistant professors of three years' standing, and others determined by itself; at Nebraska, of deans, heads of departments and others named by the Regents; at the Catholic University, of delegates from the faculties. The tendency seems to be toward a preponderance of administrative officers, and undoubtedly these functionaries are best acquainted with the problems that press for solution and they alone have a first-hand knowledge of the practical working of the university regulations. This predominance is increased in some institutions by erecting the administrative members of the Senate into an administrative board which has power to act provisionally in the Senate's name. The result inevitably is a concentration of power and the influence of the administration becomes too great. The administrative board should enforce rules but not make them.

"Another plan is that of University Councils. These councils are set up to consider matters that concern two or more faculties or the university as a whole. Their function seems to be limited, as a rule, to the giving of advice. Their membership is usually composed of administrative officers and delegates from the several faculties. At Harvard, for instance, the University Council considers questions which concern more than one faculty and questions of university policy. There is little evidence of the success of these councils; as a rule, they are without legislative power and merely pass on suggestions to the lawmaking bodies of the university. There is ground for the belief that they frequently have merely a theoretical existence. A debating society without power to enforce its decisions does not appeal to strong men.

"There seems to be a marked tendency to independence of the separate faculties within the limits of their commissions, and to a superior board of limited membership, and also to a predominance of power of administrative officers. Such a system leaves the ordinary member of the faculty without power or influence in academic policies. The analogy of our State and Federal governments may be wisely followed. The Regents are the Supreme Court, the faculties are the States, and the Senate, limited in membership, is the Congress. Democracy grows into republi-

canism, and representation takes the place of direct legislation. But here in California we have developed the initiative and referendum, and I would have the private academic citizen clothed with similar power to initiate new policies and to delay or annul legislation that has been made by his representatives. There are many professors who have a distaste for all faculty politics, who loathe administrative duties, who shun faculty meetings, and who long to give themselves wholly to study and teaching. Such men desire to place the government of the university in the hands of colleagues who possess their confidence, yet they feel that there should always be the latent power of intervention. They hope that the necessity for such action may not happen and that their scholarly peace may be unbroken; but the possibility of such intervention may well be a curb on the acts of legislators and administrators.

"Whatever the original meaning of the word university may have been, it is now a whole made up of parts: The task of every university is unity in diversity, freedom for all and wise oversight and control by all, efficiency in administration, wisdom in legislation, democracy in opportunity, and temperance in action. Whatever ability the younger members may possess in advancing the corporate interest ought to be developed and used; nor should the older men with their weight of experience be rejected from counsel, nor the administrative officers with their superior knowledge of the actual condition of things be disregarded. Any scheme of university government that fails to profit by adequate employment of all these factors is fundamentally unstable and will inevitably prove unsatisfactory."—*W. A. Merrill, University of California Chronicle.*

EXTRACTS FROM INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF L. D. COFFMAN—  
AS PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.—

"A university is a community of scholars; it breathes the spirit of the social order; it is constantly engaged in an attempt to understand the meaning of the age; it inculcates the craft spirit of the profession; it molds character. Every member of a university is a locus of influence. The individual professor still has limitless opportunities to make an impression upon his students. He must play his part; he must accept and express in his daily



life the sacred obligation of his profession if the university in every respect would serve its true purpose. He must assist by every act in building that subtle, pervasive and irresistible force which can best be described by the term 'the institutionality of the university.' Its constituent elements are the attitudes, the standards, the ideals and the traditions of the institution.

"A university is not an aggregation of individuals merely; it has its social mind, to which every individual contributes. The social mind of a university is not lifeless and inert; it is a powerful dynamic touching the life of faculty and student at every turn. Every stimulus that beats in upon the consciousness of an individual, influences him for good or ill. Consequently, none but the best influences should prevail in a university. The development of a genuinely wholesome institutionality through the personnel of a high-minded faculty, and the associated life of students, faculty in class rooms, libraries, laboratories, commons, union buildings, auditoriums, stadiums, is the supremely important problem of a modern university. The primary factor of institutionality in a university is studentship, but a university is no longer a school merely. It is a republic of minds, dedicated to the dispassionate consideration of the problems of life, and dominated by a wholesome philosophy of helpfulness and mutual good faith. Just as the largest achievement of an individual is himself, so the largest achievement of a university is itself. It makes its own soul—a soul that resides in the best thoughts, the best feelings, and the best conduct of every one connected with it, and in the attitude of the community in which it is located toward it. . . .

"Universities need to make a rigorous study of the materials of education. Nothing would pay larger dividends than for faculties to become students, both of the art of the teaching and of the materials of instruction. University teachers in America are more interested in discussing administrative devices, ways of securing recognition in the administration of their institutions, and the rules and politics of educational organizations, than they are in becoming better class-room workers.

"When credits and hours and wages and recognition are the main themes of a body of teachers, we may be certain that their idealism has been colored and tintured by the industrialism of



the times, rather than by the professionalism of their calling. Just as many teachers are disposed to emphasize questions and problems that lie at the periphery of their realms, so many students think in terms of credits, hours', semesters', and years' work, and the result is that thoroughness of scholarship is in danger of being neglected.

"A university does not engage in propaganda, but its very atmosphere breathes of the spirit of helpfulness and of interest in the problems of men everywhere. Its graduates should live in a republic of minds that is not limited by time nor geographical boundaries. If this concept seems ideal it is none the less important for that reason. When a university ceases to be saturated with high-minded cosmopolitanism, a spirit of mutual helpfulness, and a desire to know and to understand the problems of the world, it will cease to be a university. When it gathers under its cloak a spurious cosmopolitanism whose insidious intent is destruction, it becomes a menace to social welfare. This great aim, this fundamental purpose of a true university we must constantly proclaim from the housetops, that we do not lose sight of it."

PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA.—"In this first century of its existence the university has trained 22,600 men. Founded by a President of the United States, sponsored by two others and the alma mater of a fourth, it has had an unusual influence in directing men to public leadership. To its credit are 9 ambassadors and ministers, 2 justices of the United States Supreme Court, 34 Senators, 130 Members of the House of Representatives, 23 governors, 18 bishops, and 38 presidents of colleges. The whole country is indebted to it for a number of distinguished services to higher education, such as: (1) The recognition of real university standards of instruction and scholarship; (2) the absolute repression of the class system and the substitution of merit for seniority in the award of degrees; (3) the first complete introduction of the elective system; (4) the establishment of distinct 'schools,' in which great subjects were grouped—for example, ancient languages, modern languages, mathematics, law, and politics—each school having its autonomy and its own standard of graduation; (5) the institution of con-

stitutional government, in academic form, with an appointed president or chairman of the faculty, holding office for one year, but eligible for reappointment by the board of visitors; (6) the promotion of self-government among the students, with the cultivation of an *esprit de corps* sustaining high standards of academic honor and scholarship."—*President E. A. Alderman.*

LIMITATION OF NUMBERS IN THE COLLEGES.—. . . "I have enjoyed very greatly, from one point of view, meeting the College President as it were 'at the other end of the telescope.' For twenty-five years, I have gone into his office to ask *Him* for things. Now, I find him sometimes coming into my office to ask *me* for things; but I find he sings exactly the same song that he did before—that he is 'broke.' . . .

"The first point I wish to mention is this: I have been very much impressed in dealing with the questions which have been put before me, with the extent to which the average American college has *not* faced the problem of a limitation of its own numbers. . . .

"A good many of you are running your institutions on that principle; but a good many of you are not. The fact that you have suddenly dropped upon you on a September or October day, more students than you ever had before and more than you can possibly take care of creates a grave temptation. To yield to it involves serious dangers. It generally means securing inferior emergency instructors; it means overloading your faculty; it means overcrowding your laboratories; it means stretching the budget to pay more men than you have money for, all results which breed trouble and undermine efficiency, both in your faculty and your student body. . . .

"How, then, can I reconcile the two propositions which I seem to have propounded; first, that it is, in my judgment, an obligation on most of our colleges to set for themselves a limit on the number of students which they will undertake to handle in any given period of time, *e.g.* a decade, and, second, that there is a demand for a vastly greater amount of accommodation in colleges than the present resources can care for. Well, I do not suppose there is any single answer to this question; if there be such, I do not know what it is. Enlarge the institution? Yes,

undoubtedly; that is part of it. Create new ones? Yes, in some parts of the country, undoubtedly. There are some portions of the country in which they are very much needed. Build up colleges on the basis of our high schools, using the junior college principle? Yes, in some parts of the country undoubtedly this is a sensible and rational thing to do. It will take time to do it, but it can be done. Shall we go on enlarging our great universities, already so flooded with students, that it makes your head swim to go into them? Possibly; but we have certainly got to split them up in some fashion. If they are not going to be mere beehives, if they are really to be human establishments at all, we have got to do something to disintegrate these great masses of students in some of the bigger institutions. I am only sure of one thing and that I have already said, *i.e.*, that we have to educate our public to the recognition of the fact, that if it is a good thing in a democracy that higher education should be as widely disseminated as possible, then democracy has got to pay the price for it, and to pay for more than it has paid up to this time."—*President J. R. Angell (of the Carnegie Corporation) in Proceedings of the Association of American Colleges.*

HISTORY FOR EVERYBODY.—"Education is really one of the newest of the arts and sciences. The idea of particular, exceptional people pursuing *learning* has been familiar to the world for scores of centuries, but the idea of preparing the minds of whole classes or whole communities for cooperations and common actions by a training in common ideas is comparatively a new one. The idea of education as learning still dominates us, and so it is that while we have numbers of teachers of history who are or who attempt to be, or who pose as historians who teach, we have comparatively few teachers of history who are teachers whose instrument is history. In relation to the science of history, and indeed to all the sciences, the importance of teacher as teacher is still insufficiently recognized.

"Now, the virtues required of the historian as of the specialist in any other science are extreme accuracy, fulness, delicacy, and discrimination within the department of his work. He is usually not concerned with a philosophical review of the whole field of his science and very chary of invading any unfamiliar

provinces of his subject, because of the great risks he will run there of making, if not positive blunders, at least incomplete statements. The specialists will catch him out, and though the point may be an utterly trivial one, he will have been caught out and that discredits the historian excessively. But the teacher's concern is primarily with the taught and with giving them a view of their universe as a whole. It is only after undergoing such comprehensive teaching that a student should be handed over to learn, by example and participation in some definite specialization of study, the finer precisions.

"The modern community has yet to develop a type of teacher with the freedom and leisure to make a thorough and continuous study of contemporary historical and other scientific knowledge in order to use these accumulations to the best effect in general education. Because this is work for teachers and not for historians. The insufficient number of teachers we maintain are kept closely to the grindstone of actual lesson-giving. Perhaps a time will come when, over and above the professors and teachers actively in contact with pupils and classes, there will be a considerable organization of educationists whose work will be this intermediate selection and preparation of knowledge for educational purposes. But in Britain at any rate there are no signs of any development of this broader, more philosophical grade of teacher. The British universities have no philosophy of education and hardly any idea of an educational duty to the community as a whole. At the Reformation they became, and they have remained to this day, meanly and timidly aristocratic in spirit. The typical British university don has little of the spirit that would tolerate and help these master teachers we need. He would not suffer them; he would be jealous of them and spiteful towards them."—*H. G. Wells, Yale Review.*

SANITY AS RELATED TO ATHLETICS.—"One is perfectly safe in saying that intercollegiate athletics are not conducted for one's health. Health is considered only in so far as it is conducive to winning. In fact many of the fundamental rules of health are flagrantly violated by the coach. It is not a question of how much work Brown should do, but of how much work Brown can stand. The man who has just recovered from a severe case



of tonsillitis or influenza is put into the game just as quickly as the coach dares. It is a question of his value to the team, and not a question of injury to himself. No man should be allowed to participate on his team after a severe illness, without a physician's certificate. Many coaches will play a man, knowing he has a weak heart or kidneys, providing the player himself will assume responsibility for accident. This is where the interests of the team are greater than that of health or even of life itself.

"... Most coaches are not educators; they are simply coaches. Some, it is true, would be educators, if they were allowed to be. They are continually being overwhelmingly impressed with the idea that they must produce winning teams. Thus they of necessity become narrow and see but one very small phase of the field of physical education. Most coaches either consciously or unconsciously instill within the athlete a feeling of contempt for the so-called gymnasium work. This is often due to the fact that they have been brought up on athletics alone and have no conception of the broad educational scope of a general program of physical education.

"... No one school can expect to win all the time. This is not according to the law of averages. It is not generous; it is hoggish. One institution cannot expect to retain athletic supremacy continuously. What it can do others will do. It would be far better for us to get the Englishman's point of view; to play for the sake of education, healthy competition, and fun; to play as hard and as honestly as possible and try to win, and, if defeated, to say that the best team won after all, and that we had an enjoyable and profitable time in the bargain. Such a philosophy has made the Englishman the best sport in the world." *P. K. Holmes, Educational Review.*

THE PROFESSOR ON BEHALF OF HIS PROFESSION.—"It is a matter of common knowledge that the scholastic training and the intellectual ability of the recruits in the teaching profession are much lower to-day than they were a few years ago. In one of the strongest of the state universities, where one hundred and fifty-five men were appointed to the teaching staff at the opening of the



present school year, ninety, or fifty-eight per cent., had received only their first degree. All of these held the rank of instructor, unless, as in several cases, they held assistant professorships. Many of them had no previous teaching experience. Only eleven of the entire number, or seven per cent., had a doctor's degree. Five years ago in this institution thirty-one per cent. of its recruits held the doctor's degree and only forty per cent. the bachelor's degree alone.

"There are, of course, many factors to be taken into account when we consider this unusual and truly alarming condition, which may be taken as fairly typical. It seems fair to the Professor, however, to suggest that his office will be much more attractive to the stronger and more able young men, if he is given more responsibility in the administration of the university, and that at the expense of the layman who is now in almost exclusive control. Men of this type needed as teachers are not attracted by the menial position now held by the Professor. For, in spite of his brave talk in the class-room and his brilliant robes, flaunted on the campus occasionally, the Professor is a servant in his own house.

"The university president who has furnished the text for this preachment, seems to have no doubt as to the ownership of the mines and the railways. The Professor is not willing to dogmatize on these issues, even in his class-room, much less in the presence of the public. He observes, however, that the public seems determined to invade to some extent the rights of private property as represented in the forests, in mines, and in transportation, and to have some say as to how those vast properties shall be administered. When the public comes to select trustees to administer its interests in these properties, the Professor is much inclined to think that it will be best for all to choose men who have been educated for and trained in the railway and the mining business rather than bankers, lawyers, and other professional men, on the existing theory of university organization that only men who have not been intimately associated with it can be trusted to direct a business. To this extent, the Professor agrees with the industrial worker: The people who best know a business can best be trusted with the management of that business."—*J. E. Kirkpatrick, New Republic.*

WORKMEN'S COLLEGES.—“In spite of initial checks and persistent difficulties, the higher education of workingmen advances apace and is spreading throughout the world. Long ago England perceived that the granting of manhood suffrage made it necessary to ‘educate our masters,’ but Ruskin College at Oxford, though an honorable pioneer, appears to have struck the wrong trail. Men from the trades-unions do not feel at their ease in a city of spacious architecture and even more spacious leisure, swarming with flanneled and beribboned youths. Nor is the university, for all its liberalism and its flirtations with guild socialism, quite trusted to give unbiased instruction. The new ‘masters’ also are Englishmen and shrewd; they prefer to instruct themselves, and indeed to instruct their new ‘men,’ by means of an education association of their own.

“At a recent meeting of the Universities Congress in London, at which the higher institutions of the entire empire were represented, Lord Haldane faced the situation frankly. The problem is to supply extension teachers who are conservative enough to please those who support the universities financially and at the same time progressive enough to suit the radical workingman. Mr. Darnley Naylor of Adelaide, Australia, who spoke in a similar vein, remarked that the lecturer in economics was usually beset by ‘a small but noisy party’ of Marxians who insisted upon leading him to the light. Yet these are but casual rubs. The general spirit of the congress was hopeful. All over the world, as Lord Haldane reported, those who work with their hands are calling for the higher knowledge. Not the least potent means of their education is the noisy argument of those who insist upon lecturing the lecturer.

“In the United States also the movement is afoot and making giant strides. In a recently issued pamphlet Arthur Gleason tells of the foundation within the past two or three years of workers’ colleges in no less than ten industrial centers—Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Rochester, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Seattle. As yet the total registration of regular students is only about 10,000, but the number is increasing rapidly. The instruction includes not only politics, economics, and science, but literature, drama, and even dancing. As in the British Empire, there is difficulty in striking

an acceptable note in the instruction. The students insist upon the right to talk back, and in Seattle succeeded in having several lecturers from the state university returned where they came from. Mr. Gleason, himself a Socialist, complains of a lack of 'open minds' among available professors, but looks hopefully to the future for a more abundant supply. In all probability there will be more open minds than Socialists. Here, as in the British Empire, Marxians are a small and diminishing minority, however clamant.

"The essential thing is that workers shall receive every encouragement in the pursuit of advanced knowledge and free discussion. That they are apparently in a way to do. 'There is a class division in knowledge,' said Lord Haldane, 'which goes deeper down than any other division, and it is that division which is producing much of the unrest in the industrial world to-day.' In so far as our institutions are based on truth and inspired by republican liberty they can only gain by a deeper knowledge of them."—*New York Times*.

#### *The Brookwood Workers' College*

"The aims of the Brookwood Resident Workers' College, scheduled to open at Katonah, N.Y., in the autumn have been outlined by a cooperating labor committee, headed by John Fitzpatrick, president of the Chicago Federation of Labor. The statement says:

"Save for the fact that it stands for a new and better order, activated by social values rather than pecuniary ones, Brookwood is not a propagandist institution.

"It earnestly and fearlessly seeks the truth, free from dogma and doctrinaire teaching. It believes that the labor and farmer movements constitute the most vital concrete force working for human freedom and that by exerting a wise social control, they can bring in a new era of justice and human brotherhood. Brookwood seeks to provide working men and women with an education which best fits them for such service.

"The college will train economists, statisticians, journalists, writers and teachers, as well as organizers, workers, and speakers for the labor and farm movements. It will be virtually a

professional school to educate workers to work in the workers' movements and frankly aims not to educate the workers out of their class.

"One of the greatest factors, if not the greatest factor, in education at Brookwood is the community living, which itself presents and offers opportunity to work out the problems of democracy as they arise from day to day.

"Nor are any persons set apart as exclusively manual workers. All participate in the daily tasks. Faculty and students perform the jobs that call for attention, from cooking to wood cutting and from farming to dishwashing. The importance and dignity of hand work and head work are both fully recognized.

"In the history courses, consideration will be given to the social forces at work through the masses rather than to the political and militaristic activities of the ruling classes. There will be a course in labor, taking in its history, organizations, problems, tactics, and its future. Music, art, and letters also will receive attention."

---

Reference may also be made to an article by Herbert Feis on the Workers Educational Movement in the United States, in *School and Society* for September 10th, with a discussion of the relation of this movement to the universities.

THE ANTIOCH PLAN.—"What American colleges most need is a new definition of the aims of general education and a new method by which there may be secured to it the concentration, energy, and enthusiasm which attend vocational and professional studies. To give the general student the virtues of specialization, not its defects, is the problem of the college of to-day. At first sight it might seem that the university, where the general student is at last in physical contact with all the resources of special research, is the place where the problem is to be solved; but experience seems to prove that it is there that the chasm is widest. It is in the very shadow of specialization that the general student shows himself least responsible, least concerned with justifying his existence. And in the mass and momentum of a university there is difficulty in organizing



the regular students, who tend more and more to become irregular, a kind of militia as opposed to the trained shock troops of the professional courses. For many reasons the small college is better fitted than the university to undertake experiments: its size, its flexibility, its environment, often give it decisive advantages. Educators have watched with close attention Amherst in New England and Carleton in Minnesota. Now Antioch comes into the picture.

"The essence of the Antioch Plan is the coordination of technical and cultural education, 'so that while the student is becoming fitted for work in a profession or other vocation, he or she at the same time will be preparing for effective citizenship.' The aim is not to treat the general college course as a preliminary to specialization, but to penetrate that course with the very material and methods of specialization. 'The Antioch program provides that the professional or technical student may spend half his time at school, and half in practical work, as nearly as possible along the line of his preferred calling. To this end students will alternate five weeks of school and five weeks at work.' Arrangements have been made with neighboring factories to employ students on this half-time basis, and it is planned to erect a factory building on the campus where a number of small industries can be housed. An obvious economy is effected when the effort which a student frequently is obliged to put forth for self-support is directed into the channels in which his educational activity is flowing. But this practical experience is to be infused with the spirit of the general educative process as a whole.

"The aim of all vocational courses at Antioch, whether professional, industrial, or commercial, is to develop in the student capacity for initiative, self-reliance, sound judgment, and the ability to carry ultimate responsibility in his calling. Antioch will not offer highly specialized courses in any occupation. It will rather aim to develop and to coordinate general knowledge and practical capability in all phases of administration. . . . Antioch is to make generalists rather than specialists.

"That this plan offers certain immediate advantages in increasing the morale of the student body is evident. For one thing, by making every student 'work his way through college,'



it promises to limit attendance to those who wish to be educated, and eliminates the vast, inert mass of those who do not. For another, it may be premised that the boy or girl whose preference for intellectual work is clear, will find his desire strengthened by the contrast between it and manual toil. The return to study after five weeks of factory or office work will take place with real zest and renewed energy. But there is a larger social principle involved. The New Society sketched by Walter Rathenau depends upon what he calls the Interchange of Labor as one of its main principles. According to this conception every man or woman engaged in mechanical toil has the right to do a portion of his day's work in intellectual employment, and every brain worker must devote a portion of his time to physical labor. The proportion between physical and intellectual toil is to be determined by tests of the citizen's capacity. As an initiation Dr. Rathenau would have the entire youth of Germany devote a year of labor service to bodily training and work. By this plan he proposes to establish a genuine equality of opportunity and a fraternity of toil, a true democracy. It is obvious that the Antioch Plan, within the limits of a college community, follows the lines which Dr. Rathenau has laid down for the regeneration of society as a whole. The experiment has thus a large social bearing, and we may expect that in the light of this fact the members of the community will give themselves to it with enthusiasm."—*New Republic*.

DISTRIBUTION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES.—Extracts from preliminary Report of the Commission of the Association of American Colleges May 21, 1921:

If we attempt to answer how many colleges are needed in the United States, we must set up some estimate of the number of American youths who will profitably attend college in the next fifty years. . . .

While no very definite figure for the number included within this classification can be obtained, the best estimate we can secure points to 500,000 young men and women in college, technical schools, or teachers' college this year (455,000 in colleges and technical schools and 45,000 of college grade in normal schools). With the population of the United States 106,000,000

this would mean an average of 1 college student per 212 population. This estimate is probably low. . . . These several figures would seem to indicate that where educational facilities are adequate we should at the present time have provision in colleges for about 1 in every 200 of our population. . . .

We can safely assert that the total number of high school graduates is rapidly increasing, that the interest in high schools is largely increasing and that over 30 per cent. of high school students enter college. It is certainly evident that no serious diminution of the supply of high school graduates to the colleges immediately confronts us.

. . . We may perhaps safely assume that there are in the country about eight million men and women eighteen to twenty-two years of age. At the present time, 500,000, or 6 per cent., of this number are in college. . . .

The Army Intelligence Test given to a million and half men indicated that 15 per cent. of our citizens are of "superior or very superior" intelligence, eminently capable of doing college work, and of a capacity that they would profit largely from this training. . . . We could conclude perhaps that when this 15 per cent. of highly intelligent youth of our population of college age all go to college we will have reached our maximum college enrollment.

This would mean at present about 1,200,000 in a population of 106,000,000, and in round numbers, 1 college student in 100 population, or a little more than twice the present relative college population.

These estimates are admittedly crude, yet it is a conclusion worth reaching even tentatively that the United States in its present educational development finds need of college facilities for 1 student to approximately 200 of the population, and that we need not contemplate provision for more than 1 student to 100 population. . . . It is sufficient to conclude that there is a field for every college reasonably well located and adequately equipped and supported for good college work, together with a reasonable number of new institutions in regions of large growth in population or which are established to meet special needs, and that an important task for the nation is to strengthen the weaker colleges until they are fitted to take their share of

the work of educating America's youth in a worthy manner. Of the 673 colleges reported in 1917-18, 495 had less than 500 students, 252 had less than 200 students. Only 178 had 500 students or over. Contemplating a probable increase in enrollment of 40,000 students a year, which perhaps is a reasonable estimate, we may conclude that the development of existing institutions can provide for future needs. We have enough colleges, if they prove to be properly located.

... it would seem probable that from 400 to 500 good colleges and universities can serve all the students who will probably enroll in America in the next few decades, at least up to 1,000,000.

... in general we should anticipate the growth of American colleges to 500 or more students, and we should not regard as generally desirable two or more colleges in a territory that cannot provide a total of considerably more than 500 students.

These statements should in no case be construed as implying that smaller colleges adequately endowed to provide a full staff and generous equipment for a smaller enrollment are not desirable. ... it does not seem desirable to establish a new college either in a territory lacking a college that cannot be expected ultimately to provide 500 college students, or in a territory where existing colleges growing to an enrollment of 500 students or more can provide adequately for future needs. It also raises the question as to the wisdom of maintaining two or more existing colleges in a territory which does not now and probably never will provide more than a reasonable enrollment for one college.

... A college enrolling 500 students will probably have to get 50 per cent., or 250 from within a radius of 50 miles. Assuming that its territory will supply 1 student from every 200 population, the 50-mile radius should include about 50,000 people and should not be largely drawn on by any other nearby college. ...

It is of course to be recognized that old colleges long established on high standards generally draw a much larger percentage of students from outside their local territory. This fact, however, cannot weigh in the foundation of a new college or in considering the future growth of a small weak college. Generally

speaking, unless the local field of 50-mile radius can supply half of its desired enrollment it will never be supplied. . . .

The intimate relation between the development of American railways and the establishment and location of colleges is shown in a series of five maps. . . .

The building of railways and the founding of colleges in the United States have kept remarkably even step . . . in each decade as railway mileage has increased the number of colleges has increased in like degree. 1850 to 1860 was the great railway-building era and in that decade more colleges were founded in the United States than in any other of its history. Since 1890 there have been only minor railway extensions and since 1890 comparatively few colleges have been established. . . .

It has been an altogether too simple and easy matter to secure a charter for a college or university in the United States. The disposition has been to let any benevolent and ambitious group of people, or even a single individual, see what they could do, and without care or consideration to bestow upon them the invaluable privilege of conferring academic degrees. There should be in every state some constitutional or statutory provision to protect well-meaning persons from needless and even pernicious effort in the establishment of unnecessary colleges and institutions which have no rational prospect of becoming efficient and creditable to American education. For the safeguarding of academic degrees, for the honor of institutions already doing sincere and creditable work, and especially for the protection of youth in their ambition for thorough higher education there should be enactments in every state somewhat as follows:

SECTION 1. A charter shall not be granted nor shall articles of association be issued to a corporation for educational purposes in this state empowering such corporation to grant degrees, until the State Board of Education shall issue certificate that the creation of such corporation will promote the general good of the state.

SECTION 2. The State Board of Education shall not issue a certificate under the provisions of section one of this act until it is satisfied that the proposed corporation has complied with the regulations of said Board for the type of institution for which it desires a charter.

**SECTION 3.** The State Board of Education shall make regulations defining the various types of degree-granting institutions, specifying the minimum requirements for the issuance of degrees for such institutions and the minimum requirements for admission to such institutions and the said standards to comprehend the amount of endowment, laboratory facilities, library equipment, number of instructors, and scope of curricula.



## MEMBERSHIP

### MEMBERS ELECTED

The Committee on Admissions announces the election of two hundred and twenty-four members, as follows:

University of Arizona, W. E. Bryan, Robert McNair Davis, Mark Ehle; University of Arkansas, William J. Baerg, John Asbury Elliott, Jobelle Holcombe, Stella Palmer, John William Read, W. B. Stelzner; University of California, Agnes Fay Morgan, Eugen Neuhaus, Edward C. Tolman; Colgate University, John Greene, Elmer W. Smith; Colorado College, Jacob Swart; Cornell University, Wallie Abraham Hurwitz; Denison University, Kirtley F. Mather; Earlham College, Arthur M. Charles; University of Georgia, Robert Preston Brooks; Grinnell College, W. S. Hendrixson, W. J. Rusk; Howard College, Julius A. W. Luck; University of Indiana, Jotilda Conklin, James E. Dunlap, Edgar G. Frazier, Mabel M. Harlan, Paul M. Harmon, John M. Hill, Edna Johnson, Jacob Robert Kantör, Edwin A. Lee, Thomas S. Luck, E. V. McCollough, Barzille Winfred Merrill, James E. Moffat, F. Payne, Grace M. Philputt, M. I. Schnebly, Will Scott, Lester B. Struthers, W. A. Telfer, Milton W. Thompson, William M. Tucker, Agnes Ermina Wells, Estella M. Whitted, Kenneth P. Williams, Ellen Williams; State University of Iowa, Clarence M. Case, Louis Pelzer; University of Kentucky, George Wesley Whiting; Lafayette College, Ezra Bowen, James Bryant Hopkins; Lake Erie College, Joanna Baker, Elizabeth B. Bower, Margaret B. Lawsing, Sarah C. Lovejoy, Mary Edith Pinney, Frances H. Relf; University of Maine, Irving H. Blake; Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Stephen Faunce Sears; University of Minnesota, William Anderson, Ross Aiken Gortner, Leroy S. Palmer, Elvin C. Stakman; Morningside College, Lillian E. Dimmitt; Mount Holyoke College, Alzada Comstock; University of Nebraska, T. Townsend Smith; College of the City of New York, Samuel A. Baldwin, Alfred N. Goldsmith, Engelbert Neus, Alfred G. Panaroni, Daniel Redmond, G. E. Snider, Arthur B. Turner; University of North Carolina, Parker H. Daggett, John Frederick Dashiell, Howard Washington

Odum, William W. Pierson; **University of North Dakota**, Erwin O. Christensen, B. J. Clawson, L. C. Harrington, Anna F. Holahan, Henry J. Humpstone; **Northwestern University**, John R. Ball, William H. Burger, Rudolf A. Clemen, Isaac Joslin Cox, Leslie E. Fuller, Clyde Leclare Grose, D. T. Howard; **Occidental College**, C. O. Esterly; **Ohio State University**, Rollo Clyde Baker, A. D. Cole, Guy W. Conrey, Harry W. Crane, Harry D. Drain, H. E. Erdman, Oscar Erf, James S. Hine, Osman C. Hooper, Alfred C. Hottes, Ralph A. Knouff, Harry Waldo Kuhn, H. C. Lord, Lewis M. Montgomery, Alice Robinson, Carl Wittke; **Ohio University**, Isaac E. Ash, Robert Lacey Borger, William Franklin Copeland, Victor Dwight Hill, Thomas N. Hoover, Clinton N. Mackinnon, William Alderman Matheny, G. E. McLaughlin, S. K. Mardis, Joshua R. Morton, Mary T. Noss, Hiram R. Wilson; **Ohio Wesleyan University**, Gordon Nelson Armstrong, Gilbert H. Barnes, J. DeLancey Ferguson, John Cunyus Hodges, E. C. Hytree, J. T. Marshman, Louis A. Pappenhagen, Thomas E. Steckel; **Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Herbert Patterson; **University of Oklahoma**, F. F. Blachly, T. H. Brewer, H. E. Cunningham, Edward Everett Dale, James C. Davis, Edwin DeBarr, C. E. Decker, Homer L. Dodge, J. H. Felgar, Charles F. Giard, Avis Gwinn, Fredrik Holmberg, Oscar B. Jacobson, Margaret J. Mitchell, Julius C. Monnet, Lawrence N. Morgan, L. B. Nice, Fred W. Padgett, J. W. Sturgis, Louis Alvin Turley, Arthur J. Williams; **University of Oregon**, Eric W. Allen, W. P. Boynton, A. E. Caswell, Herman A. Clark, Peter C. Crockett, W. C. Dalzell, Burchard W. DeBusk, Edgar Ezekiel DeCou, Colin V. Dymont, C. A. Gregory, William G. Hale, William L. Hayward, W. E. Milne, Earl L. Packard, Mary Hallowell Perkins, E. C. Robbins, Fred Lea Stetson, W. F. G. Thacher, George S. Turnbull, Mary Elizabeth Watson, Raymond H. Wheeler, Harry B. Yocum; **The Pennsylvania State College**, William Day Crockett; **University of Pittsburgh**, Paul D. Converse, Davenport Hooker, Montfort Jones, M. K. McKay, Charles Reitell, A. J. Schneeweiss; **Princeton University**, William S. Carpenter, Thomas King Whipple; **Purdue University**, Laurenz Greene, George N. Hoffer, H. H. Peckham; **University of Redlands**, A. Harvey Collins, H. E. Marsh, Egbert Ray Nichols, H. C. Tilton, Herbert E. Wise; **Smith College**,

Sidney N. Deane, Wilson T. Moog, James Huntley Sinclair, H. Edward Wells; Stanford University, Edgar E. Robinson; Syracuse University, A. E. Brainerd, Frank N. Bryant, George T. Hargitt; University of Texas, W. C. Binkley, H. J. Muller, E. R. Sims, William Leigh Sowers; Trinity College (Conn.), Morse S. Allen, Vernon K. Kriebel, Horace C. Swan; Union College, George Hermann Derry, Frederick W. Grover, Raymond Mathews; University of Utah, Richard B. Ketchum, Orin Tugman; George Washington University, J. de Siqueira Coutinho, Merton C. Ferson; Washington and Lee University, R. Granville Campbell, Lucius Junius Desha, Thomas J. Farrar, W. Dana Hoyt, James W. Kern, J. R. Long, John W. H. Pollard, Franklin L. Riley, Edgar F. Shannon, Livingston W. Smith, W. LeConte Stevens, Robert H. Tucker; University of Wyoming, Robert M. Smith; Yale University, Joshua Irving Tracey.

#### NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following fifty nominations are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Cambridge, Mass., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions\* and will be considered by the Committee if received before December 1, 1921.

The Committee on Admissions consists of Florence Bascom (Bryn Mawr), Chairman, Edward Capps (Princeton), J. Q. Dealey (Brown), A. R. Hohlfield (Wisconsin), G. H. Marx (Stanford), and F. C. Woodward (Chicago).

Percy P. Adams (Architecture), Oregon  
 James W. Alexander (Mathematics), Princeton  
 Zella E. Bigelow (Home Economics), Idaho  
 Edward Milton Bragg (Naval Architecture), Michigan  
 John M. Brewer (Education), Harvard  
 Ford A. Carpenter (Meteorology), Southern California  
 H. P. Davis (Dairy Husbandry), Idaho  
 Edward Leerdrup Eriksen (Civil Engineering), Michigan  
 Frank R. Finch (Engineering), Michigan  
 Floyd Whiting Gail (Botany), Idaho  
 James J. Gill (Law), Idaho

\*Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, 222 Charles River Road, Cambridge, Mass.

Carl H. Grabo (English), Chicago  
J. Leonard Hancock (Ancient Languages), Arkansas  
Charles W. Hungerford (Plant Pathology), Idaho  
Harrison Randall Hunt (Biology), Mississippi  
Gerard Edward Jensen (English), Connecticut College  
Katherine Jensen (Home Economics), Idaho  
J. Hugo Johnson (Electrical Engineering), Idaho  
S. Guy Jones (Chemistry), Redlands  
M. A. Jull (Poultry), Macdonald College, Canada  
James W. Kyle (Latin and Greek), Redlands  
G. L. Luke (Physics), Idaho  
Ross Walter Marriott (Mathematics), Swarthmore  
George McD. McConkey (Architecture), Michigan  
F. N. Menefee (Engineering), Michigan  
J. T. Messenger (Education), Idaho  
F. G. Miller (Forestry), Idaho  
George Frederick Miller (Education), Oklahoma.  
Philip A. Parsons (Sociology), Oregon  
Edwin W. Patterson (Law), Iowa  
L. Chas. Raiford (Chemistry), Iowa  
Henry Earle Riggs (Civil Engineering), Michigan  
George Robertson (Biology), Redlands  
Albert J. Rousseau (Architecture), Michigan  
Maximilian J. Rudwin (Romance Languages), Swarthmore  
Theodore R. Running (Engineering), Michigan  
Margarete L. Sargent (Modern Languages), Idaho  
Herman I. Schlesinger (Chemistry), Chicago  
Edmund Davison Soper (Religion), Northwestern  
Henry Harrison Strauss (Ancient Languages), Arkansas  
Mary Louise Todd (English), Redlands  
H. J. Tromanhauser (Foreign Languages), Idaho  
C. C. Vincent (Horticulture), Idaho  
Jacob Warsharo (Modern Languages), Nebraska  
Waldemar Westergaard (History), Pomona  
Henry Nelson Wieman (Philosophy), Occidental  
Emma K. Whiton (Mathematics), Redlands  
Clyde E. Wilson (Mechanical Engineering), Michigan  
Louis E. Wise (Forest Chemistry), Syracuse  
J. E. Wodsdalek (Zoology), Idaho